

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF OREGON

ANTONINIJA S-G,<sup>1</sup>

No. 6:23-cv-01969-JR

Plaintiff,

OPINION AND ORDER

v.

COMMISSIONER, SOCIAL SECURITY  
ADMINISTRATION,

Defendant.

**BAGGIO, District Judge:**

On November 26, 2024, Magistrate Judge Jolie A. Russo issued her Findings and Recommendation (“F&R”, ECF 15), recommending that this Court affirm the Commissioner of Social Security’s (the “Commissioner’s”) final decision denying Plaintiff Antoninija S-G’s (“Plaintiff’s”) application for Title II Disability Insurance Benefits and Title XVI Supplemental Security Income under the Social Security Act. Neither Plaintiff nor the Commissioner objected. This Court ADOPTS Judge Russo’s F&R.

**DISCUSSION**

The magistrate judge makes only recommendations to the court, to which any party may file written objections. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C). If a party objects, the court “shall make a de

---

<sup>1</sup> In the interest of privacy, this Opinion and Order uses only the first name and the initial of the last name of the nongovernmental party in this case.

novo determination of those portions of the report or specified proposed findings or recommendation to which objection is made.” *Id.* The court is not, however, required to review, de novo or under any other standard, the factual or legal conclusions of the magistrate judge as to those portions of the F&R to which no objections are addressed. *Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140, 149 (1985); *United States v. Ramos*, 65 F.4th 427, 433 (9th Cir. 2023). While the level of scrutiny that the court applies to its F&R review depends on whether a party has filed objections, the court is free to accept, reject, or modify any part of the F&R. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C); *see also Thomas*, 474 U.S. at 154.

The Court has reviewed the pertinent portions of the record *de novo* and finds no error in the Magistrate Judge’s F&R.

### CONCLUSION

The Court ADOPTS Judge Russo’s Findings and Recommendation (ECF 15). Therefore, the Commissioner’s final decision denying Plaintiff’s application for Title II Disability Insurance Benefits and Title XVI Supplemental Security Income under the Social Security Act is AFFIRMED. Accordingly, this case is DISMISSED with prejudice.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

DATED this 13th day of January, 2025.

*Amy M. Baggio*

---

AMY M. BAGGIO  
United States District Judge